BUILDING DEVELOPMENT COMMISSION
Minutes of September 20, 2016 Meeting

Jonathan Bahr opened the Building-Development Commission (BDC) meeting at 3:03 p.m. on Tuesday, September 20th 2016.

Present: Chad Askew, Jonathan Bahr, Tom Brasse, Melanie Coyne, Travis Haston, Michael Stephenson, Ben Simpson, Hal Hester, Rob Belisle, Terry Knotts, Walter Kirkland, Rodney Kiser and Scott Shelton

Absent: John Taylor

1. MINUTES APPROVED

Melanie Coyne asked for revision to the August 16th minutes, noting misspelling of Chad Askew's name on page 1. Melanie Coyne made the motion to approve revised minutes from the August 16th Building Development Commission Meeting; seconded by Travis Haston. The motion passed unanimously.

2. BDC MEMBER ISSUES & INDUSTRY ASSOCIATION ISSUES

Hal Hester thanked the Department with their help on his project. Chad Askew announced his last meeting. Glenn Berry, AIA introduced himself as the new AIA Representative. Terry Knotts thanked the Department for auto-notification in residential; very helpful. Tom Brasse asked for quarterly updates on DSTAC and a CMUD Liaison. Jim Bartl asked Tom to sketch this out as to what he wants update to look like.

3. PUBLIC ATTENDEE ISSUES

No public attendee issues.

4. CO/CC RETENTION POLICY IMPLEMENTATION SCHEDULE

Jeff Griffin the CO/CC retention policy and addressed, modifying AE Best Practice to include; AE's will have a "code generation box" in EPS to enter code generation (2012, etc.). On BCC mid-cycle approved code changes used on a project, AE's will propose using by alternate method documentation (must be accepted by AHJ). Both of these are transferred from EPS to POSSE for permit print out (either electronic or paper version) and later transferred by POSSE to the CO record and print out. Regarding the implementation schedule, we can modify the proposal to include both CC & CO. CO-CC retention in POSSE-Winchester can be effected in 3 to 6 months. Creating a "best practice" code generation and BCC change use record tool in EPS and POSSE can be effected by Spring, 2017. Scott Shelton asked about retaining permit and inspection records for longer than six years, seconded by Melanie Coyne. Tom Brasse asked if records are searchable.

5. NOV POLICY/PROCESS PROPOSAL

David Gieser discussed the NOV Policy/Process proposal, saying that an advance copy of the draft policy change was distributed to members on September 14. The policy doesn't require a formal vote by the BDC and asked if members have comments or concerns about the change. David described the background, saying this is a challenging area of enforcement for most departments, involving a mix of projects that never complete their work or may not have taken out permits at all, also addressing project failures. This policy change mirrors current procedures, but uses automation more heavily to aid the inspectors, so that they don't get bogged down with the NOV process. It also completely removes the most problem prone enforcement issues from the inspector and places the burden on the management team. The policy in brief, creates three enforcement groups or buckets. Group/bucket one, includes work permitted but incomplete but only for code violations that are not life threatening. The owner remains obligated to maintain code compliance, regardless of whether or not the project is closed out. If the owner or their contractor fails to address the issue, POSSE brings the incomplete work to their attention, and emphasizes the owner's ongoing responsibility to maintain the building in compliance with the NC Building Code under which it was constructed. Group/bucket two is work performed without a permit. This most often consists of work the inspectors discover while performing their regular work inspecting permitted construction, or which are uncovered while responding to citizen requests for service (RQs) phoned in to the office. The primary focus here is to move the project into the permitting and inspection (P&I) process. Stop work orders are issued manually by the inspector in the field, and permit holds are placed on the address, causing an auto generated letter to the property owner advising them of the condition. The latter increases the likelihood the work will be permitted, since failure to do so creates a risk adversely impacting future sale of the

property. Group/bucket three are significant code compliance failures. This group is limited to code compliance failures or a catastrophic building failure that may place large groups of occupants at great risk. The South Park roof collapse is a good example, and in fact the response model for bucket three is built around our response at South Park, including the following basic steps; a) The Directors assign a management team member to the point (not an inspector). b) The owner provides AE expertise to evaluate the failure or code compliance deficiency and propose a mitigation strategy. The Department must concur with the proposal. c) The owner retains an NC licensed contractor and obtains permits to execute repair work. d) The owner's AE team provides special inspections service, assuring the contractors installation matches the AE's mitigations strategy, which is part of the permit. We've reviewed this policy in detail with County Attorney Marvin Bethune and his comments are incorporated. In addition, we reviewed the draft policy with the Technical Advisory Board on September 12th and they had no objections. We think this will clarify the process for inspectors, make better use of their time, and employ automation to encourage permit holders to complete work or engage the P&I process appropriately. If the BDC has no objections, we'll confirm the supporting tech development and implementation schedule to you in the October meeting.

Melanie Coyne asked to explain the triple fee process. Jonathan Bahr indicated the need to amend Group 1 so that records are kept until the issue is resolved; even if beyond six years.

6. HIGH SUPERIOR PERFORMING AE PILOT PROPOSAL

Jim Bartl and Patrick Granson discussed this proposal and mixing two current programs together, the AE Pass Rate Incentives and Professional Certification. AE Pass Rate Incentives was introduced in 2010, grades LDP submittals in OnSchedule plan review, on a pass-fail basis per review cycle event, based on quarterly performance. Thereafter, project teams accrue benefits or added project submittal requirements based on their quarterly grades. Professional Certification was introduced in 1999, allowing qualifying* LDP's to schedule a 90% preliminary code review and thereafter, if other agency holds are released, and by including a certification statement in each professional discipline, the project moves immediately to permit issuance. The 90% preliminary review, combined with the LDP's "professional certification" status, takes the place of the full plan review. Qualifying (*) means LDP's have taken & passed the same certification exams as code officials. Jim went on to say that we have a 5-year history of LDP performance within AE Pass Rate incentives. We suggest the top performers within the highest (superior) performing category in AE Pass Rate Incentives have shown their expertise in applying the NC Building Code to real projects, on a level at least equal to the NC code official's certification exams. This initiative would say LDP's with an AE Pass Rate incentives pass rate of 95% or greater, would automatically qualify for participation in the Professional Certification Program. There are a lot of details to work out before the program could be confirmed as viable & start. We think LDP's should maintain a 95% or higher pass rate in AE Pass Rate incentives for the previous 12 months to automatically qualify for participation in Professional Cert Program. As in other AE Pass Rate benefit assignments, the entire LDP team must meet or exceed the 95% threshold for the project to use Professional Certification. Projects with LDP teams achieving the 95% threshold at plan review application would hold that status through the life of the project. LDP's who fall below the 95% threshold would again begin working to gain 12 months at or above 95% to automatically qualify for participation in the Professional Certification Program. Initially we think this idea should be available in OnSchedule, CTAC & RDS, but not Mega. The remainder of the program works as described on the Professional Certification webpage. There are a bunch of technology details that need to be worked out before this idea could launch. The idea of a pilot has the ACM's support; also has passed review by the County Attorney.

7. DEPARTMENT STATISTICS AND INITIATIVES REPORT
August, 2016 Statistics
Permit Revenue
- August permit (only) rev - $2,608,655, compares to July permit (only) rev - $2,302,941

- Fy16 budget projected monthly permit rev; $23,310,691/12= $1,942,557;
  - so August is $660,098 above projection
- YTD <u>permit</u> rev = $4,911,597 is above projection ($3,885,225) by $1,026,481 or 26%.

Construction Value of Permits Issued
- Report temporarily suspended.

Permits Issued:

	July	August	3 Month Trend
Residential	5236	5590	5294/5971/5236/5590
Commercial	2593	2782	2590/2738/2593/2782
Other (Fire/Zone)	270	316	334/272/270/316
Total	8099	8688	8218/8981/8099/8688

- Changes (July-August); Residential up 6.67%__; commercial up 7.29%__; total up 7.27%__

Inspection Activity: Inspections Performed

Insp. Req.	July	August	Insp. Perf.	July	August	% Change
Bldg.	7482	9050	**Bldg.**	7493	9038	+20.6%
Elec.	7933	9352	**Elec.**	7296	8557	+17.3%
Mech.	4217	5204	**Mech.**	3936	4808	+22.1%
Plbg.	3543	4277	**Plbg.**	3146	3675	+16.8%
Total	23,175	27,883	**Total**	21,871	26,078	+19.23%

- Changes (July-August): requests up 20.3%; inspect performed up 19.23% (across board)
- Insp performed were 93.5% of insp requested__
-

Inspection Activity: inspections response time (new IRT report)

Insp. Resp. Time	OnTime %		Total % After 24 Hrs. Late		Total % After 48 Hrs. Late		Average Resp. in Days	
	July	**Aug**	**July**	**Aug**	**July**	**Aug**	**July**	**Aug**
Bldg	83.7	81.0	96.9	95.7	99.6	99.3	1.20	1.24
Elec.	73.7	75.5	95.4	95.0	99.5	99.1	1.31	1.31
Mech.	77.0	77.5	95.5	95.6	99.5	99.1	1.28	1.27
Plbg.	87.5	85.1	98.3	97.0	99.8	99.3	1.14	1.18
Total	79.6	79.1	96.3	95.6	99.6	99.2	1.24	1.26

- Overall average down slightly; Elec & Mech up <1-2%; Bldg & Plbg down <2%

- Per the BDC Performance Goal agreement (7/20/2010), the goal range is **85-90%; so the August average is currently 5.9% below goal range.**

Inspection Pass Rates for August, 2016:

OVERALL MONTHLY AV'G @ 82.82% in August, compared to 82.35% in July

Bldg:	July – 76.68%	**Elec**:	July – 82.59%
	August – 75.66%		August – 83.32%
Mech:	July – 84.97%	**Plbg:**	July – 88.33%
	August – 85.98%		August – 90.27%

- MEP all up <1-2% -; Bldg down 1%
- Overall average up<.5% from last month, but above the 75-80% goal range.

On Schedule and CTAC Numbers for August, 2016

CTAC:

- 92 first reviews, compared to 122 in July
- Projects approval rate (pass/fail) – 77%
- CTAC was 34% of OnSch (*) first review volume; (92/92+175 = 267) = 34.46%
    *CTAC as a % of OnSch is based on the total of only scheduled and Express projects

On Schedule:

- January, 15: 185 -1st rev'w projects; on time/early–92.88% all trades, 93.5% on B/E/M/P only
- February, 15: 192 -1st rev'w projects; on time/early–94.75% all trades, 96.5% on B/E/M/P only
- March, 15: 210 -1st rev'w projects; on time/early–95.1% all trades, 97.5% on B/E/M/P only
- April, 15: 240 -1st rev'w projects; on time/early–91.5% all trades, 96.75% on B/E/M/P only
- May, 15: 238 -1st rev'w projects; on time/early–95% all trades, 94.75% on B/E/M/P only
- June, 15: 251 -1st rev'w projects; on time/early–94.95% all trades, 95.82% on B/E/M/P only
- July, 15: 218 -1st rev'w projects; on time/early–91.1% all trades, 90.75% on B/E/M/P only
- August, 15: 215 -1st rev'w projects; on time/early–91.5% all trades, 93% on B/E/M/P only
- Sept, 15: 235 -1st rev'w projects; on time/early–87.12% all trades, 92.5% on B/E/M/P only
- October, 15: 229 -1st rev'w projects; on time/early–91.79% all trades, 91.62% on B/E/M/P only
- November, 15: 220 -1st rev'w projects; on time/early–93% all trades, 92% on B/E/M/P only
- December, 15: 224 -1st rev'w projects; on time/early–89.4% all trades, 90.75% on B/E/M/P only
- January, 16: 188 -1st rev'w projects; on time/early–85.85% all trades, 84.64% on B/E/M/P only
- February, 16: 219 -1st rev'w projects; on time/early–84.88% all trades, 82.75% on B/E/M/P only
- March, 16: 241 -1st rev'w projects; on time/early–84% all trades, 85.25% on B/E/M/P only
- April, 16: 240 -1st rev'w projects; on time/early–88.38% all trades, 91.25% on B/E/M/P only
- May, 16: 237 -1st rev'w projects; on time/early–90.62% all trades, 94.5% on B/E/M/P only
- June, 16: 230 -1st rev'w projects; on time/early–91.63% all trades, 95% on B/E/M/P only
- July, 16: 215 -1st rev'w projects; on time/early–91.9% all trades, 93% on B/E/M/P only
- August, 16: 219 -1st rev'w projects; on time/early–92.75% all trades, 93.25% on B/E/M/P only

Booking Lead Times

- o On Schedule Projects: **for reporting chart posted on line**, on August 29, 2016, showed
    - o 1-2 hr projects; at 2 work days booking lead, but City Zoning 7 days

- o 3-4 hr projects; at 2-3 work days lead, except Elec-6, MP-16, CMUD-12 & City Zoning-22 days
- o 5-8 hr projects; at 2-3 work days lead, except Bldg & Elec-13, MP-17, Health & CFD-16, CMUD-12, City Zon'g-22 days
- o CTAC plan review turnaround time; BEMP at 2 work days, and all others at 1 day.
- o Express Rev'w booking lead time; 5 work days for small projects, 5 work days for large projects

7.2. STATUS REPORT ON VARIOUS DEPARTMENT INITIATIVES

BDC OnSchedule Subcommittee
The BDC voted to create a subcommittee to study Gartner's recommendation to replace OnSchedule with a FIFO approach, across the board. BDC volunteers are Chair Bahr, Ben Simpson, Rob Belisle, and Chad Askew-Glenn Berry jointly. Offers will be extended to ASLA, PENC and AIA Charlotte to invite a select group of their other members interested in the topic. Subcommittee meeting is tentatively scheduled for October 11 at 2:00 p.m. Invites will be sent out on September 21st.

New BDC Member Orientation
New BDC member orientation scheduled for October 5th, to include Terry Knotts, Walter Kirkland and Glenn Berry.

Updates on Other Department Initiatives in the Works
Progress on RDS-CTAC Plan Review Audit
RDS audit effort completed with 4th meeting on August 5th. CTAC audit efforts started on September 9th. Tentatively plan to deliver a report in the October or November BDC meeting.

Follow-up on Gartner/Task Force Recommendations Discussion
The Department updates the BDC periodically regarding progress on TF follow up work. The next update is tentatively scheduled for November, 2016.

NC Building Code Council Activity Update
The NC Building Code Council (BCC) met in Raleigh, NC on September 13. The BCC has no new code change petitions submitted for consideration. The BCC held a public hearing on 9 code change petitions. Public comment received thru October 14. The BCC took final action on 5 code change petitions, approving 3, denying 1 and deferring 1. The BCC also discussed status of their preparing adoption of the 2018 NC Building Code (based on the 2015 IBC for all but electrical). The adoption schedule: All 2018 NC Building Code adoption proposals submitted to the BCC as Part B items in the December, 2016 meeting, along with fiscal note documentation. The 2018 NC Building Code proposals will become Part C items in March, 2017, with public hearings held by the BCC on their adoption. Final action by the BCC on adoption of the 2018 NC Building Code family is tentatively scheduled for their June, 2017 meeting.

Manager/CA Added Comments
No Manager/CA added comments.

8. Adjournment
The September 20th meeting of the Building Development Commission adjourned at 4:17 p.m. The next meeting of the Building Development Commission is scheduled for Tuesday, October 18th 2016.